

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CHURCH OF AMBROSIA, ZIDE DOOR
CHURCH OF ENTHEOGENIC
PLANTS,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, Et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 4:22-cv-4655-YGR

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: FAILURE TO
PROSECUTE**

TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:


You are **HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** in writing by **no later than Monday, July 31, 2023**, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff filed this action on August 12, 2022. (Dkt. No. 1.) On November 28, 2022, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, as plaintiff did not serve defendants within 90 days. (Dkt. No. 12.) Plaintiff then filed an amended complaint and served defendants. On January 20, 2023, defendants moved to dismiss. (Dkt. No. 22.) The Court granted extensions on plaintiff's opposition deadline three times in response to plaintiff's representation that additional time was needed due to the alleged complexity of the issues raised by the complaint. The Court's final order set an opposition deadline of June 5, 2023. (Dkt. No. 26.) Two days after missing that deadline, plaintiff again requested an extension of 60 days due to the complexity of the issues raised. (Dkt. No. 27.) Plaintiff gave no explanation for missing the existing deadline or indicate counsel had put any effort into preparing an opposition. The Court thus denied the motion for extension. On July 5, defendants timely filed a reply to their motion to dismiss.

Accordingly, plaintiff must explain why dismissal should not be granted. Failure to timely

1 respond to the order to show cause will result in a dismissal without further notice. The hearing
2 set for **Tuesday, August 8, 2023** is **VACATED**.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: July 24, 2023

5 
6 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

United States District Court
Northern District of California